மதுரை மாவட்—
ப.எண் 8983

8983

162

Original

List of Retainable papers for 18 53 57/ 57

Received Letters. Miscellaneous. Madura Collector's Office.

VOL 8983
39113

Date.	Number.	From whom received.	Substance.
[illegible] March 1853.	"	Fischer Esquire	Stating that nearly two months had elapsed since he addressed him on behalf of the Zemindar of [illegible] Nathwo, praying for the restoration of the caval manium lands in the [illegible] village
31.3.1853	"	Government	Extract from the Proceedings of The Court of Wards of 31st March 1853, containing certain instructions as to the disposal of certain Desacaval Inams and Sotrintrums in the Shivagunga Zemindary now under the Court of Wards.
[illegible].4.53.	"	Do	Approving the reductions effected in the general establishment of the Zemindar, when the European Tutor was engaged.
30.6.53	"	Sub Secretary	The court of Wards are of opinion that Ramasawmy Tevar's former ~~opinion~~ wages is a sufficient recognition of the minor's right to the Zemindari.

S. M. [illegible]

செப்பனிடுவதற்காக எடுத்துக் கொள்ளப்பட்ட

ஜூன் மாதம் வருடம் 1984

செப்பனிட்டு முடித்த

ஜூன் மாதம் வருடம் 1984

ஆராய்ச்சி உதவியாளரின் கையொப்பம்.

List of Retainable papers for 1853-57

Received Letters. Miscellaneous Madura Collector's Office.

Date.	Number.	From whom received	Substance.
2-10-53	274	Civil Judge of Madura	Requesting to be informed of him how much of such sum may be considered as the proceeds of the 10 cheys of those lands held by ~~him~~ Pingala Krishna Rao as mortgagee.
[illegible]-53	281.	do.	Requesting to be informed what portion of the Rs 2378-4-[illegible] therein referred to may be considered as the proceeds of the one Inam of the land called Zegamana Kundegay Ambalam Sayden vaykal.
[illegible].12.53	296	do.	Requesting to be informed what portion of the Rs 2378-4-8 was transmitted to this Court.

List of Retainable papers for 1855 – 51

Received Letters. Miscellaneous Madura Collector's Office.

Date.	Number.	From whom received.	Substance.
26.3.55	"	J. Kendall	Submitting an estimate of the value of the property owned by the Mission at Shevaganga
3.5.55	1075	Government	Extract from the Proceedings of the Court of Wards of 3rd May 1855 regarding the title to the Shevaganga Zemindary being under litigation, the villages claimed by the petitioner were attached by the order of the Sudder Adawlut
28.5.55	1288	Do	The Court of Wards authorising the Collector of Madura to bid, on behalf of the minor Zemindar of Shevaganga as high as 15000 Rupees for the two villages belonging to Pechammal Nacheyar about to be sold by public auction.

3

List of Retainable papers for 1855–56

Received Letters. Miscellaneous Madura Collector's Office.

Date.	Number.	From whom received.	Substance.
4.1.55	931	Government	Extract ~~from~~ from the minutes ~~minutes~~ of Consultation, calling the attention of the Court of Wardas to the outstanding arrears in the various Zemindaries.

List of Retainable papers for 1856-57

Received Letters. Miscellaneous. Madura Collector's Office.

Date	Number.	From whom received.	Substance.
21-4-56	1191	Government	Extract from the Proceedings of the Court of Wards, and stating that there is a doubt as to the validity of this claim & the mesne profits of the mortgaged lands exceed the amount of Principal & Interest demanded, the Court of Wards authorises the payment of Rs 2450-0-0
23-4-56	1215	Do.	Forwarding 4 statements of the claims of Letchmanan Chetty against the Minor Zemindar of Shevaganga on account of debts contracted by his late father.
25/4/56 ~~7-56~~	1288	Do.	Forwarding 4 statements & 2 other enclosures, explanatory of the claim of Pichakottai Chetty against the Minor Zemindar on account of debts contracted by his late father &c.

List of Retainable papers for 1856-57

Received Letters. Miscellaneous Madura Collector's Office.

Date.	Number.	From whom received.	Substance.
7.7.56	2344	Government	Reporting, in reference to the subject of Nattukottai chetty's claim against the Shevaganga Estate, that the guardian of the minor Zemindar admits the correctness of the chetty's claim.

List of Retainable papers for 1857-57

Received Letters. Miscellaneous Madura Collector's Office.

[Numb]er.		From whom received.	Substance.
16.1.57	176	Government	Informing that disputes regarding the title to the Kurnam [illegible] in a Zemindary village are cognizable by the Madalut Courts alone, & stating that as to the privilege of holding the Kurnam office the petr should address the Collector.
16.2.57	596	Do.	Informing that the Deeds of Grant were not forwarded with the Collector's letter &c &c – stating that as the claimants failed to enforce their rights in the interim, that the Court of Wards feel precluded from authorising restoration of any portion of the hamlet of Ponnengudy.

List of Retainable papers for 1856-57

Received Letters. Miscellaneous Madura Collector's Office.

Date.	Number.	From whom received.	Substance.
4.5.1857	667.	Government	Stating that the Claimant Ganapathy Pillai has allowed a period of more than 12 years to pass since the order of Blackburne in January 1839 without pressing his claim.
5.5.57	41.	Clement Dale Esq. Govt pleader Sudr Adalut.	Stating that the petition presented is one behalf of the minor Zemindar of Sheevagunga, on reference to his letter No. 180 of 1857 of 25th April.
22.6.57	60.	Do.	Requesting to forward Rs 280 being the amount of his fees in each case, and promissing to inform him of the amount expended for Stamps.
6.5.57	1414.	S. Ramangaloo Naidoo & Others.	Being given to understand that a portion of the villages attached to the Sheevagunga Zemindari had been given back to the owners, I beg to be informed [illegible].

List of Retainable papers for 185~~7~~ 3-57

Received Letters. Miscellaneous Madura Collector's Office.

Date.	Number.	From whom received.	Substance.
			whether you will deliver the village named named, Keela Kandamani Pantam, Avlangamuni etc
7.9.57	~~57.~~	Ramnagar Shastri	
	1764 / 1857	Zemindar of Shevaganga	Petition of the Zemindar of Shevaganga, appealing against O.S. No. 48 of 1856.
"	2156 / 1856	Civil Judge Madura.	Extract from the Proceedings of the civil court of Madura in reference to O.S. No. 4 of 1856 for the execution of the Decree thereon Rs / 106.9.?

Answered 22nd March 1853 — 10

11

Recd 17/3/53

To

R D Parker Esqr

Collector of Madura

Sir,

It being now near a twelve month since I last addressed you on behalf of the Zemr of Padamattoor, praying the restoration of the Zamul Manium lands in the Teroopparanum Village belonging to him, which had been seized by your Predecessor in July 1842 (1252), on the false representation that some Ain lands belonging to the Zemindary of Shevagunga was included in it, I trust I shall be excused for again calling your attention to the same, and praying for justice to my client.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most Obedt Servant

[signature] Wischm.

Madura

March 1853

[illegible]

Rn. Do. Parker Esq.

Collr. of Madura

Read into record 12th Novr /53

No 1085 — 1853

Revenue Department.

15

Extract from the Proceedings of the Court of Wards dated 31st March 1853.

Read again letter dated 31st January 1852 from the Collector of Madura, requesting instructions as to the disposal of certain Desacaval Enams and Sotuntrums in the Shevagunga Zemindary now under the Court of Wards.

(Here enter No. 20)

Read also a subsequent letter from the same Officer dated 8th December 1852.

(Here enter No. 215)

It appears from Mr Parker's own statement and Enclosure 2 in his last letter, that when Mr Drury was sent as Commissioner to Madura in 1843, the Shevagunga Zemindary being then under charge of the Collector, information was given to him by the Ameen of Tiroopoovanum, that the Padmatoor Polygar, subordinate to the Shevagunga Zemindar, held certain Desa Cavil lands in that Cusbah, but had encroached on the Ayen lands of the Zemindary and imposed unauthorized Sotuntrums.

On

2. On this Mr Drury issued a Fa-Need dated 18th February 1843 that "pending a full enquiry into the case," the Poligar's Desa cavil Enams not only in the Cusbah of Firoopoovanum but in 9 other neighbouring Villages, and his Sotuntrums, were to be "held under attachment."

Enclosure 2 in From Collr 8th December 1852.

3. One-fourth of the lands and Sotuntrums thus attached belonged to another inferior Poligar of Nattacoody; but before any enquiry was made, the Zemindary of Shevagunga was restored to the Proprietor, who gave back to the Nattacoody Poligar his share, but continued the rest under his own charge.

4. Since the Shevagunga Zemindary has been under the Court of Wards, the Pudmatoor Polygar, through his Agent Mr Fischer, has applied to the Collector for the restoration of his Desa Cavil Enams, which are estimated at 78 Cheys of Nunjah land and 36 Coorakums of Poonjah, as also his Sotuntrums.

5. The extent claimed corresponds with the extent sequestered by Mr Drury's order.

6. When the Shevagunga Zemindary was first made subject to a permanent

Peishcush

Peishcush to the British Government in Fusly 1211 (1801), the Zemindar furnished to Mr Lushington accounts of his Estate for the purpose of having the Peishcush definitively settled. – In these accounts, obtained by Mr Parker from the Zemindar's Cutcherry (for there is no copy in the Huzzoor) the extent of Desa Cavil land is entered at 37 9/16 Cheys, of which 32 are under cultivation, the Inaiwarum or income to the Poligar being reckoned at 179 odd cullums.

7. In an Abstract account furnished to the Collector Mr Peter in Fusly 1226, as copy of the 1211 Accounts, there is no specification of the extent of land, but only to the Inaiwarum of 179 odd cullums. This quantity of paddy is said to be "first "deducted as the produce of Desacavil and "Kolkryem Enam of Oya Tawer of Pad:"matoor, and afterwards recredited and in"cluded in the Total. The Sotuntrum is "not shewn."

Para 4 of Collr's letter 31st January 1852.

8. In the accounts from Fusly 1222 to Fusly 1240 (1830) the extent is entered at different amounts varying from 17 to 18 3/4 Cheys

9. But in the Accounts for Fusly 1241 / 1831, the Enam is entered at 78 Cheys Nunjah

and

and 36 Coorookums Poonjah, and this is the extent zufted in 1843 and now applied for in recovery.

10. The present Curnum states (for the one who drew out the Accounts of Fusly 1241 is dead), that the reason of this entry is, that the Head Tahsildar (the Zemindary being then under management) verbally directed the whole Ayacut to be entered, and not only the cultivation - it being this latter only that had been usually entered.

11. Mr Parker is also of opinion that when the Permanent Sunnud was given and the peishcush fixed, Mr Lushington resumed the Desa Cavil Enams as he had done in Tinnevelly, and incorporated them in the Ayen, and he recommends not only that the land now claimed should not be restored, but that all Desa Cavil Enams in the Zemindary should be resumed, as the object for which they were originally granted (Police) is not now required, the Government having taken the Police into their own hands; but the Collector proposes* that the Cavilgars be allowed to continue

* From Collr 31st Jany 1852, para 11.

in enjoyment of the Istimrars on the under-standing that when called upon, they shall assist the Police.-

12. The arguments on the part of Mr Fischer, the Poligar's Agent, are, 1st, that Mr Lushington never resumed these Enams, and that there was no regular settlement of accounts preparatory to the Zemindar being placed in possession by the British Government, he having been merely put in on the defeat of a former Zemindar who was en-gaged in hostilities with the Ruling power. He therefore repudiates the Accounts of Fusly 1211. 2dly, he impeaches the integrity of the Accounts furnished to Mr Peter by the Zemindar in Fusly 1226, and he quotes from the Board's Proceedings where, in the case of the Elleenthengoody Polipût, they observe that "the Istimrar Accounts had been rejected by the local authorities as totally incorrect and inadmissible."

Enclosure A in Mr Fischer's letter of 8th May 1852. see Enc: 1 in From Collr 8th December 1852.

13. Mr Fischer also refers to an official communication in 1824 from Mr Peter the Collector, to the Civil Judge, in which he states that the ac-count furnished by the Zemindar in Fusly 1226 is not a correct copy of the Accounts of Fusly 1211.

Enclosure B to Mr Fischer's letter.

Mr

14. Mr Fischer also refers to an official communication from Mr Parker to himself* to the Court in 1847, in which he states that the original Istemrar Account of Fusly 1211 is not to be found in the Huzzoor, and as to the Accounts sent in in Fusly 1226 there has been much correspondence from Mr Peter declaring them not to be trustworthy.

*Enclosure to Mr Fischer's

15. Mr Fischer's other argument is "long possession", and he refers to a case where the Government deprived him of a large piece of land in his Mootah of Salem, because they had held it undisputed for more than 12 years.

16. Lastly he asks, why if the Desacavil lands in Shevagunga are considered Ayen, the Court authorized the Nattagoody Poligar's land to be restored to him.

17. The Court of Wards take the following view of the matter — 1st as regards the resumption of the Desacavil lands by Mr Lushington. They agree with Mr Fischer that the circumstances under which the British Government placed the new Zemindar in possession in 1801 were such as to make it very doubtful if Mr Lushington carried out the plans

he

p. 886. Appendix to the Vth Report.

-he had adopted in Tinnevelly as regards the Desa Cavil Enams. In the Report of the Special Commission 5th April 1803, the Commissioners observe that, "although the state "of the information which we are enabled to "submit to your Lordship in Council, is neither "so mature, nor so extensive as we undoubtedly "consider to be desirable, yet comparing the "inconvenience of further delay with respect "to this Zemindary alone, at the time of ar-"ranging the permanent assessment of the "other Southern poligars, we fear that the "diffidence and intrigue to be apprehended "during the prosecution of further enquiry, "are liable to be attended with more incon-"venience to the interest of the Zemindar and "of the Company than can be compensated "by the probable result of further invest-"igation. We concur therefore in the opinion "of the late Collector, that to protract the "Settlement of this Zemindary, is unadvisable" And there is nothing on the Board's Record to shew that the Desa Cavil lands were resumed, whatever the intention might have been. Neither does the statement made by Mr Parker in para 4 of his letter of January 31st 1852 as quoted in para 7 of these Proceedings bear sufficient weight to

to enable the Court to authorize him to act on the presumption of the Enams having been assumed. The main point for consideration is therefore the extent of land which should be given up to the Poligar.

18. The explanation of the Curnum's successor as to the accounts of Fusly 1241 exhibiting 78 Cheys Nunjah and 36 Coorakums Poonjah, whilst up to that date it had been entered at extents varying from 17 to 48⅔ Cheys is altogether unsatisfactory, and the Court have no hesitation in preferring the accounts of the Zemindar's Cutcherry for Fusly 1211 and the Accounts sent by him to Mr Peter in Fusly 1226, to the assertion of the present Curnam.

these different accounts [illegible] from the [illegible]

19. It is true that the Zemindary accounts are not sufficiently authentic to be depended upon in every point which they profess to detail, but where there is no evidence whatever except possession for a long period to oppose to them, the Court are by no means prepared to repudiate them. In the present instance, the detailed Accounts of Fusly 1211 and the abstract Accounts of 1226 correspond exactly as to the mailwarum. Mr Parker also observes

in

in his last letter (para 7), that the instance Mr Fischer adduces in his Enclosure D where Mr Peter discredited the accounts the Sudr Adawlut acted on them; and the Court cannot overlook the testimony of the Special Commissioner in 1803 that Mr Lushington bestowed "every leisure moment "to the correction of all the general statements "and information received at different times "since he became Collector; having maturely "considered the statement of the actual re- "sources and collections in Shevagunga "during the last year." The Commissioners state in the same Report "much credit "appears to be due to the correctness of the "accounts furnished by the present Zemindar "of Shevagunga for the Fusly year 1211".

Ve Report, p. 886 Appendix

20. The strongest argument in favour of the claimant is long possession, but with the views above expressed as to the weight to be attached to the Zemindary accounts, the Court of Wards would not be justified in giving over the whole extent claimed. It appears to them that the excess above 37½ Cheys has been made up of encroachments on the Ayen land of the Estate, and the Law of Limitations referred to by Mr Fischer cannot be pleaded when possessi

possession is acquired irregularly.

21. The Court therefore resolve to instruct Mr Parker to make arrangements for the restoration to the Pudmatoor Poligar, with arrears, of the extent of land entered in the Accounts of 1811 - Viz 37 Cheys, 9 7/8 Annas. He should also be permitted to enjoy the Sotuntrums thereto appertaining.

22. The Court are not prepared to accede to the proposition made by Mr Parker in para 11 of his letter of 8th December 1852 as to the resumption of all Dess Cavil lands. These Enams have from long occupation become to be considered as Family Estates not tied strictly down to the conditions on which they were originally given.

23. If it is ever intended to claim them on the part of the Zemindary the Court would leave it to be carried out, if the Courts will permit, by the Zemindar himself when he enters into possession; but they would not wish their own Officers to be parties to so harsh and unpopular a measure.

(A true Extract)

W H Bayley
Secretary

To
R. D. Parker Esqre
Collector of Madura.

Compd Newbigging

No. 69
1853

From
The Court of
Wards.
31st March 1853

[illegible pencil notes]

Taken & sent 30th May 1856
in Sheristadar's Depttn.

Revenue Departt.

Copy of this on Stampt Paper sent to Sub Court
as per Diary order of 1st Novr/58 - on the 15 Novr/58
[illegible]
as Sub Collr in Charge

Extract from the Proceedings of the Court of Wards dated 14th April 1853.

Read the following letter from the Collector of Madura dated 25th February 1853.—

(Here enter No. 23.)

As it appears by the address of Namasevoya Taver to the Collector of Madura dated 25th February 1853, and by the deposition given by him before witnesses, that he has acknowledged the title of the present Minor Zemindar of the Shevagunga Estate, and has formally relinquished his own claims to it, the Court are of opinion that he is entitled to maintenance as a member of the Zemindar's family, and accordingly authorize the allowance of 150 Rupees per mensem recommended by the Collector. They do not however concur in the opinion expressed by Mr. Parker that the Estate should discharge the debts contracted by him.—

The

2. The Court fully approve of the reductions effected in the general Establish=ment of the Zemindar when the European Tutor was engaged.—

(A true Extract)

W H Bayley.
Secretary

To

J. Clarke Esqre

Sub Collector in Charge
of
Madura.—

Comd
[illegible]

Faked posted 13 September 1853

33

Revenue Department

Extract from the Proceedings of the Court of Wards dated 30th June 1853.

Read letter from the Acting Collector of Madura dated 28th May 1853.

(Here Enter No 68)

The Court of Wards are of opinion that Ramasevoya Tavers former Urzee is a sufficient recognition of the Minor's right to the Zemindary, and a valid withdrawal of his own claim to it. they consider it unnecessary therefore to discuss the question further.

(Above Extract)

[illegible]
Sub Secretary

To
T. Clarke Esq.
Acting Collector of Madura

Comp[d] [illegible]

1853

From the Court of Wards

Dated 30 June 1853

with 3 Enclosures

உ

[illegible]

[illegible] | [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] | [illegible]

[illegible] | [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] | [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Ad. 25/53

Answ.d 5th Dec.r/53

No. 254
1853.

25

Civil Court Madura
26th October 1853

From,

C: R: Baynes Esquire
Civil Judge of
Madura

To,

R: D: Parker Esquire
Collector of
Madura

Sir,

Adverting to the Acting Collector's letter of the 29th Ultimo forwarding Rupees 2378 - 4 - 8, being amount collected from the Caval lands of the Padamattoor Zemindary during the period they were under attachment. I have the honor to beg, that if practicable, you will inform me, how much of such sum may be considered as the proceeds of the 10 cheys of those lands held by Pingala Kistna Row as mortgagee - and how much as that of the 5 cheys held in like manner by one Oyaoundal Ummaul -

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant
C R Baynes
Civil Judge

Ind. W Haslam
H.D.P.

Ans^d 5th Dec^r /53

Ent. 2^d/5^m

No. 381
1853

37

Civil Court Madura
21st November 1853

From,

C: R: Baynes Esquire
Civil Judge of
Madura

To,

R: D: Parker Esquire
Collector of
Madura

Sir,

In reference to my letter of the 26th Ultimo No. 234, I shall be obliged if in addition to the information therein asked, you will inform me what portion of the Rs 2378 – 4 – 8 therein referred to, may be considered as the proceeds of the one maw of the land called "Yejamana Koondegay Umbalom Sabyen Voytkul" situated in the Village of Serospa: yanom; the proceeds of which are claimed under an alleged grant from the late Zemindar of Padamatoor by the parties noted in the margin

Sunkeranaroy: ana Iyen & Cunnien as heirs and representatives of Sunkara Sastry the grantee

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant

C R Baynes

Civil Judge

Decr 13/53

Answered 29th Decr 53 No. 296
1853

39

Civil Court Madura
12th December 1853

From,

C: R: Baynes Esquire
Civil Judge of Madura

To,

R: D: Parker Esquire
Collector of Madura

Sir,

I shall feel much obliged if in addition to the information afforded with your reply of 5th Instant to my letters of 26th October and 21st November 1853, you will inform me what portion of the Rs 2378 - 4 - 8 transmitted to this Court with the Acting Collector's letter of 29th September last, may be considered as the proceeds of one mani of land situated in Caleyandoor a hamlet attached to Teroopavanum - the proceeds of which are claimed under an alleged grant from the late Zemindar of Padamattoor by the party noted in the margin -

Aroonagery Sastry

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant

C R Baynes

Civil Judge

N. 1850/53

From The Civil Judge

Madura

Dated 12th Decemr./53

26/3/53

Madura March 26, 1855

My Dear Mr Parker

I enclose an estimate of the value of the property owned by our Mission at Sivagunga, which we wish to sell. We consider it worth Rs. 4350; but as we are desirous of disposing of it, we are willing to make a deduction of Rs 1050 from that value. Will you be so kind as to ascertain whether the property will be needed by Government, & let me know the result, as soon as is convenient.

We have not included in the estimate the church on the compound, as we intend to take it down & dispose of the materials. Will you also be so kind as to inform me, whether there is a probability that Government will require the mission

property in Madura, now occupied by
Mr. Muzzy. If needed, I shall be happy
to forward you an estimate of its value

Very sincerely Yours
J. Rendall

Estimate of the value of the property at Sivagunga
offered for sale, by the American Madura Mission

One terraced roofed bungalow, with four large, & two small rooms under terrace & a tiled verandah on all sides =	Rs - a 3300 - 0
Out houses	350 - 0
Buildings formerly used for a Boarding School	350 - 0
Three wells, deep; one of which is large	250 - 0
Substantial wall - - - - - -	100 - 0
Value -	4350 - 0
Proposed deduction from value	1050 - 0
Rupees	3300 - 0

Rec'd into Record 26th May
Vide Rec'ds 1st Ap 1855
9-5-5

The Petitions endorsed & given to the Mr Deputt.
for a tick(?) for delivery 11 May 1855

See letter to Court of Wards 7 April 1856 —

Revenue Department

No 1095

Extract from the Proceedings of the Court of Wards dated 3rd May 1855.

Read letter from the Collector of Madura dated 31st March 1855.

(Here enter No 47)

From the above report, the Board understand that while the title to the Shevagunga Zemindary was under litigation, the Villages claimed by Petitioner were attached by order of the Sudr Udawlut and so continued until by a Decree of that Court they passed with the rest of that estate into the possession of the late Zemindar

2 The Petitioner is stated to have preferred his claims to Mr Blackburne, by whom they were rejected and against this decision no appeal seems to have been made

3 The late Zemindar conferred the Villages on his Sister from whom, on his death, they were resumed and they are now in charge of the Court of Wards —

It

It thus appears that the Villages are now held in trust for the Minor under a regular judicial decree; and until this is set aside by competent authority, the Court of Wards would not consider itself justified in making them over to Petitioner, who, it may be remarked, has had ample time to assert his rights and to appeal from the decision, if he had been so inclined —

The Collector having omitted to give the date of Mr Blackburne's order, it does not appear whether Petitioner's right of Appeal is now barred by lapse of time - but if it is, it would be a conclusive argument against the admission of his claims -

It is observed that in para 1 the Collector mentions that 2 of the Villages are entered in the more recent accounts of the Zemindary as "Kolkrarjem" or the property of the Zemindar; but this point, which seems to tell against Petitioner's claim, is not noticed in the subsequent part of the letter —

Under the view now taken by the Board, it is unnecessary to dwell on this

point

point, or on the difficulties regarding the intermediate possession of Mahomed Na-chear, and the recovery of the mesne profits of the Villages while held by the late Zemindar and his Sister. The Collector will inform the Petitioner (is informed that) that the Court of Wards hold the Villages in trust for the Minor under a decree of the Court, and that they cannot be surrendered to him until that decree is modified and his rights are admitted by competent judicial authority.—

Since this [illegible] an End.

(A true Extract)

[illegible signature]
Secretary

To
R. D. Parker Esq.re
Collector of Madura.

To Read Sent to Govt. Vakeel
2d June 1855

Revenue Department

7-9-55

49

No. 1288

Extract from the Proceedings of the Court of Wards dated 28th May 1855.

Read letter from the Collector of Madura dated 18th May 1855.

(Here enter No. 89)

The Court of Wards authorize the Collector of Madura to bid, on behalf of the Minor Zemindar of Shevagungah, as high as 15,000 Rupees, for the two Villages belonging to Pichee-mal Natchear, about to be sold by public auction.

(A true Extract)

[signature]
Secretary

To
R. D. Parker Esq
Collector of Madura.

Comd. R. Newbyging

2

Revenue Department

No. 931.

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation Under date the 4th August 1855.

Read the following letter from the Secretary to the Court of Wards.

(Here enter 4th June /55. No. 1374)

× × ×

P. 8. Independently of the balances to be remitted, the arrears in some of the Estates, as they stood at the date of the several reports, call for the Courts attention, in view to their early settlement either by remission or collection; for
× Para 8 instance, the balances in Sundracottah in Tanjore
* Para 19 in the Shevagunga Zemindary in Madura after the remission of Rs. 37,510 as above sanctioned and in the Estate of Moopumarvetta Conje Ramen
Para 26 in Malabar.

× × ×

(True Extract)
(Signed) J. D. Bourdillon
Secretary to Government.

(True Copy)

E. D. [illegible]
Acting Secretary

Comp. [illegible]

No. 267

From

The Court of Wards

Fort St. George

Dated 19th September 1855

Revenue Department

No. 1191

Extract from the Proceedings of the Court of Wards dated 21st April 1856.

Read letter from the Collector of Madura dated 17th March 1856.

(Here enter No. 63)

As there is no doubt of the validity of this claim, and the mesne profits of the mortgaged lands exceed the amount of Principal and Interest demanded, the Court of Wards authorize the payment of Rupees (2450-0-0) Two thousand four hundred and fifty (half of that amount being the Principal borrowed) to the representative of Danashkooty Naick, the original mortgagee, from the Funds of the Estate.

(A true Extract)

[illegible]

Secretary

To

R. D. Parker Esq.

Collector of Madura.

No 108

From Court of Wards

Dated 21 April 1806

Ta Recd to Cash keeper
5th May 1856

Entry

Revenue Department

No 1215

Extract from the Proceedings of the Court of Wards dated 23d April 1856.

Read letter dated 25th February 1856 from the Collector of Madura, forwarding four Statements explanatory of the claim of Lutchmanen Chetty against the Minor Zemindar of Shevagunga on account of debts contracted by his late father, and requesting authority to liquidate the same.

(Here Enter No 42)

The documents and accounts in support of this claim having been inspected by the Collector and fully examined in his Cutcherry, and the balance of the debt being found to be Rupees (18,329-8-.) Eighteen thousand three hundred and twenty nine and annas eight, the Court of Wards autharise the disbursement of that amount from the funds of the Estate, to Lutchmanen Chetty in discharge of his accounts with the late

late Zemindar.

2. For the reasons stated by the Collector in para 7 they approve of his intention to give his attention to well authenticated claims like the present before noticing those of a doubtful character.

(A true Extract)

[illegible]
Secretary

To
R. D. Parker Esq
Collector of Madura.

No. 115/1856.
From the Board of Revenue
Dated 23 April 1856
[illegible]

Conf.d [illegible]

Recd. 6 May/1856

Camble

Answered 7th July 1856

Revenue Department

No. 1288

Extract from the Proceedings of the Court of Wards dated 28th April 1856.

Read letter from the Collector of Madura dated 29th March 1856, forwarding four Statements and two other enclosures, explanatory of the claim of Pitchacotty Chetty against the Minor Zemindar on account of debts contracted by his late father.

(Here enter No. 71)

1. The Court of Wards observe that the Chetty's claim is composed of three distinct items.

1st A Balance of Rupees 6,756-5-5 inclusive of Interest, on his accounts with the Zemindar.

2d A sum of Rupees 884-12-3 which is not supported by receipts from the Zemindar and does not appear in his accounts, but the items composing which are duly entered in the Chetty's daily Chittah.

3d A sum of Rupees 29,470 styled old debts, but not further particularized and unsupported by any bonds.

2. The Court agree with the Collector

Collector in considering the last claim inadmissible on account of its vagueness, nor does it appear to them that he is called upon to enter into an enquiry likely to be attended with so much difficulty.

3. In support of the 1st and 2d items, documentary evidence is adduced; but before sanctioning payment of the amount, the Court wish to be informed, whether the justice and correctness of the demand is admitted by the Guardian of the Minor Zemindar. –

(A true Extract)

[illegible]
Secretary.

To
R. D. Parker Esqr
Collector of Madura.

Compd
A Newbigging

No 188
From Court of Wards
Dated 20th April 1808

Taken 30/7/56

Trill

1 Revenue Department

No. 2344

67

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 25th July 1856.

Read letter from the Collector of Madura dated 7th July 1856.

(Here enter No. 149)

In reply to the reference made to him by the Collector on the subject of Pichacootty Chetty's claims against the Shevagunga Estate as set forth in Mr. Parker's letter of the 29th March 1856, the Guardian of the Minor Zemindar admits the correctness of the Chetty's Accounts, but claims that explanation should be given on two items included in them. Viz: the disposal of a sum of Rs 3013-6- entrusted to him for certain payments. and 2dly The delivery of a Golden girdle set with precious Stones, for which the Estate was debited with a sum of Rs 12499-12. he also questions the propriety of the manner

manner in which the dates are fixed for making up the accounts, and the charge of interest on an accumulated balance of interest.

2. With reference to the 1st point on which the Guardian requires explanation, Mr Parker shews that the receipt of the sum alluded to was duly admitted by the late Samookum Peshiar Cootty Iosier and 2° that the Arunal or Girdle is also in possession of one or other of the family as is evident from the admissions of Piche-maul Nachyar. The Board concur with Mr Parker in considering that the manner in which the accounts have been made up and the interest calculated are not open to exception, and resolve to sanction the payment to Pichacootty Chetty of the two first claims detailed in Mr Parker's letter of the 29th March, amounting to Rupees 63821-1-8 with interest on the principal to the date of payment.

(A true Extract)

To
R. D. Parker Esq
Collector of Madura

J. C. Tulloch
Secretary

Comp. Mackenzie

Recd 21 Jany 57

Revenue Department

No. 176

61

Extract from the Proceedings of the Court of Wards dated 16th January 1857.

Read Endorsement made by the Acting Collector of Madura dated 18th December 1856 on Petition, Board's No. 64 of 1856.

(Here enter No.)

Ordered that the following Endorsement be passed on Petition No. 64 of 1856.

"In view of the information furnished by the Collector on the subject of this petition the Court decline to interfere.

2. Disputes regarding the title to the curnum Meerassy in a Zemindary Village are cognizable by the Adalut Courts alone, and with reference to the privilege of holding the Ambalam Office, the Petitioner should address the Collector under Regulation VI of 1831 as directed by him."

(A true Extract)

To

R. J. Sullivan Esqr.

Acting Collector of Madura

[signature]

Acting Secretary

No 21

From Board of Reve

Dated 16 January 179[illegible]

With 1 Enclo

Ans. 3 March 57

[illegible] 4 March 57

Revenue Department

Endorsement given to the [illegible] April 57

63

No. 596

Extract from the Proceedings of the Court of Wards dated 26th February 1857.

Read letter from the Acting Collector of Madura dated 24th January 1857.

(Here enter No. 17)

As the Shevagunga Estate is now in litigation, and the Hamlet was attached more than 12 years ago by Mr Blackburne in pursuance of an order by the Sudr Udalut, the claimants not having taken any legal means to enforce their alleged rights in the interim, the Court of Wards feel precluded from authorizing restoration of any portion of the Hamlet of Poonnengoody as recommended by the Acting Collector.

2 It is observed that the Deeds of Grant were not forwarded with the Collector's letter as stated in the margin of Para 1.

(A true Extract)

[illegible]

Ag Secretary

To

R. I. Sullivan Esq.

Ag Collector of Madura.

No 83
From Court of Wards
Dated 26 Feby 1857

Recd 8 March 57 Sunday
[illegible]

Ans 12 March 57

[illegible]

Revenue Department

66

No. 667

Extract from the Proceedings of the Court of Wards dated 4th March 1857.

Read letter from the Collector of Madura dated 31st December 1856.

(Here enter No. 299)

As the claimant Ganapathy Pillay has allowed a period of more than 12 years to pass since the order of Mr Blackburn in January 1839 without pressing his claim, and the Shevagunga Estate is now in liti-gation, the Court of Wards feel obliged to decline, though reluctantly, to entertain his application for payment of the debt alleged to be due on account of the Curnum's Merassee which he held on Mortgage, and which was attached by Mr Blackburne in pursuance of an order by the Sudr Udalut passed in consequence of a Petition by Angamootoo Naikan.

From Madura 18th August 1839.

(A true Extract)

J A Lim
Ag Secretary

To
R. I. Sullivan Esq
Ag Collector of Madura.

Exd P. Robinson

[illegible] the County of Kent

[illegible] 1837

Recd. 9 May 1857
[illegible]

Ans 13 May 57

Answered 4 June 1857.

No. 41

From Clement Dale Esquire Government Pleader Sudr Udalut
To R. J. Sullivan Esquire Acting Collector of Madura

67

Madras 5th May 1857

Sir,

Para 1 I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Letter to my address of date and No. noted in the Margin with the enclosures.

25th April 1857 No. 418.

2. I observe that the Extract from the proceedings dated the 6th February 1857 × does not refer to any petition from the Collector I therefore gather that it is on behalf of the Minor Zemindar of Shevagungah alone that it is wished I should present the Appeal from that Order.

× sent to Mr Dale [illegible] × confirming the [illegible] × already submitted by Mr Dale [illegible] as parties

3. With reference to the proceedings of 10th February 1857 I conclude it is wished that I should appeal from those on behalf of the Collector and the Minor Zemindar.

4. Assuming such to be the case, and that you determine on appealing, I shall require to be furnished with Two Vakalutnamahs; one by the Guardian of the Minor, and another joint Vakalutnamah by yourself and the Guardian, before I can file petitions of Appeal.

5. From the papers before me, I do not see clearly on what grounds an Appeal is to be supported, and to enable me to state grounds in my petitions, and to argue them in Court, I will thank you to furnish me at your earliest Convenience with Translations of the Plaint, and any other pleadings; as also of all the petitions filed

filed pro and con-

6 Without seeing the plaint I cannot tell the form or object of the Suit, and consequently am unable to judge, whether other Proprietors in the Village than those actually sued, would be affected by a Judgment in this Suit, or be precluded from asserting their rights thereafter; if they would be affected, then clearly <u>all</u> the Proprietors should be made parties, not only the Minor Zemindar, and we might urge that as a reason for the Plaintiff not being permitted to proceed with this Suit as at present framed.

7. If on the other hand they would <u>not</u> be affected, then there can be no necessity for their forcing the Plaintiff to make them Parties, nor in that case can they be restrained by the injunction or the proceedings in the present Suit, but such of the Proprietors as are not included in the Plaint, may proceed forthwith to repair the Tank &c., and if the Plaintiff wishes to restrain <u>them</u> she must either amend her present Suit, by making all such Proprietors parties, or she must commence a fresh suit or suits against them, and obtain another injunction directed to <u>them</u>.

8. I wish to be informed specifically how the Minor Zemindar was concerned in the Act complained of; it is stated the Villagers were making repairs, was the Minor a contributor to the Expence? or in any other way joining in the Expence?

9. I presume Government is not interested in the Village or the repairs to the Tank, and as the Minor is represented by his guardian, I am decidedly of opinion that the Collector is not a necessary party, and I advise

that

that you do not join in the Appeal   69

10 Then 2ndly as to the injunction itself, without having the plaint before me and seeing the grounds alleged by all parties, it is impossible to form an opinion whether the Civil Judge is right or wrong, as a general principle, Courts will not permit the risk of injury to one Party, pending litigation to try rights claimed by one, and denied by the other. If the facts alluded to in your Letter be proved, I doubt not the Court will decide against the Plaintiff's claim, but in the interim, and until the Court has such Evidence before it, I do not see how we can ask the Court to interfere; I shall however be glad to receive any suggestions you may wish to offer for my consideration on that point. of course if it be decided that the Minor is not a necessary party, our Appeal regarding the injunction must be dismissed, as we should have no locus standi

11 I apprehend however, the course suggested in para 7 is the one that will the most readily bring the point to an issue, so far as the Minor being made a party to the litigation is concerned.

12 On your furnishing me with Translations of the Plaint, other pleadings, (if any) and of the several petitions, I shall be better able to advise you. be good enough to furnish these as Early as possible, as there is not much time for corresponding at so great a Distance

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant

Wm. Dale
Govt. Pleader

From
Govenl Mead
[illegible] Nuedrak
[illegible]

Answered 26 June /57

No. 60

From Clement Dale Esquire Government Pleader Sudr Udalut

T. R. J. Sullivan Esquire Acting Collector of Madura

Ans 26 June 57

71

Madras 22d. June 1857

Sir

Para 1. I do myself the honor of acknowledging receipt of your Letter to my address of date and No. noted in the margin with its Enclosures and of informing you that I have since perused all the papers.

4th. June 1857 No. 548

2. If I had advised in the first instance, I should have recommended that the Defendants should have objected to the injunction, and also to the suit not being against the proper Parties; and if the injunction were not amended, or dissolved, and the Court had refused to call on the Plaintiff to add all the Parties who are interested in the result of the suits, I would have advised that they (the Defendants) should have appealed to the Sudr Udalut, and I feel assured the Defendants would have succeeded in their Appeal as regards the want of Parties; In which case the Plaintiff must have made the Minor and the other Sharers parties; or she would have been stopped in her suit

3. I do not however consider it was a politic step to move on behalf of the Minor Zemindar, but I should have preferred (if the Court had not complied with the Defendants request and had refused to call on the Plaintiff to amend her

plaint by adding the necessary Parties) that the Minor Zemindar and the remainder of the sharers (irrespective of the 2 Defendants) should have proceeded with the repairs as suggested in Para 7 of my Letter of the 5th May last; which would have compelled the Plaintiff to be the actor in the Courts, by proceeding against the Minor Zemindar and the other sharers; by which our object would have been attained with more advantage.

4. As already stated I am of opinion that if the Defendants had Appealed to the Sudr Udalut they must have succeeded so far as compelling the Plaintiff to add the Parties. As regards the Minor Appealing, his position will be very different, and I do not feel so confident of succeeding for him, as I should do for the Defendants; but after giving the matter full consideration I am of opinion that as the Motions were made in the lower Court on his behalf, it is not prudent to permit the Orders to stand without Appeal, so that I have now decided on advising Appeals against both Orders, although I am not so sanguine of success as I wish to be, when advising such a Course. Strong arguments can be used on behalf of the Minor, and I shall urge them on the Consideration of the Court

5. There being 2 Orders I must present 2 Appeals, and the rules of the Sudr Udalut require that a Vakalutnamah should be filed in respect of each Case. I must therefore request that you send me a Vakalutnamah, on proper Stamp, in the Enclosed form; please see that the names are correctly inserted

and

and all blanks filled up then sign it and get it signed by the Guardian and despatch it so as to reach me not later than the 30th Instant.

93

6. I have also to request that you will forward to me Rupees 280 being my fees of 40 Pagodas in Each Case - The Order on the Accountant General for Rupees 10 which you forwarded to me originally I will now Cash, and inform you of the Amount Expended for Stamps &c.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servant
Wm. Dale [signature]
Govt. Pleader

From Govt. Madras [illegible]

[illegible] Madras

Dated 22d June /87

No. 30

Ans 10 Aug. 57

No answer is required

In Equity,

M. Vencatasawmy Naidoo
vs
M. Soondra Ramanjooloo Naidoo
and M. Ramanjummah

75

To
The Collector
of Madura.

Sir,

Having been given to understand that a portion of the Lands, or Villages attached to the Sevagunga Zamindary which were under Zufty or Seazures together with the property of the said Sevagunga Zamindar at that Station by the Circar had been given back to the owners; we beg therefore to request, that you will be good enough to inform us, whether you could deliver the Villages Named Paulow, Aulungaum, Heelocondrum, [attached to the said Sevagunga which are also now under Zufty together with the property of the said Zamindar] belonging to the Estate of M. Veerasawmy Naidoo deceased herein; if a proper application were to be made through the above Named M. Ramanjummah, who has obtained under our Consent the Administration to the Estate of the said M. Veerasawmy Naidoo deceased, to get in Collect and receive Vide an Articles of Agreement entered into by us and her dated 6th February 1855, or will it be necessary that we should further apply to the Board of Revenue.

We have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servts.

M. Ven Catasawmy Naidoo
M. S. Ramanjooloo Naidoo

Madras
1st Augt. 1857
Paratha Mootiapen
Street Door No. 56

1857

From Mr Venkatasamy Naidoo
& Administrators of the
Estate of the late Veerasamy
Naidoo

[illegible] August 1855

No. 51

In Equity, M. Vencatasawmy Naidoo vs M. Soondra Ramanjooloo Naidoo and Dr. Ramanjummah.

Wes 15 Sib.

no order apply to B.R.

To The Collector of Madura.

Sir, With reference to our letter No. 30 of the 6th August last forwarded by Post, we are sorry to state that you have not as yet favored us with a reply, we would therefore again beg to request your goodness to inform us, whether you have any objection to deliver the Villages named Pantom, Aulungaum & Keelacondanim attached to the Senagungah in the Zillah of Madura, which are now under Jufty together with the property of the said Senagungah Zamindar, belonging to the Estate of Dr. Veerasawmy Naidoo deceased herein; if a proper application were to be made to you through the above named Dr. Ramanjummah who has obtained under our consent the Administration to the Estate of the said Dr. Veerasawmy Naidoo deceased, to get in collect and receive, or would it be necessary that we should apply to the Board of Revenue for the same.

We have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servts.

Madras
9th September
1857

M. Vencatasawmy Naidoo

M. S. Ramanjooloo Naidoo

1857

From The Executors

of the late Veeraiany

Dect

Madras

9 September 1857

To The Honorable The Judges of the Court of Sudr Udalut.

We 12.10.57 — 79

The Humble Petition of Sreematoor Rajah Moodoo Vizia Rhagoonadha Boda Goorooswamy Pareya Oodaya Tover the Zemindar of Shevagunga a Minor under the Age of 16 Years by Richard James Sullivan Esquire the Acting Collector of Madura and Agent to the Court of Wards and Daisyga Iyengar Officiating Guardian to the said Minor presented by Clement Dale Esquire Barrister at Law.

Sheweth

I That one Mahamay Natchiar of Mailaroomany in Shevagungah has instituted in the Court of the Moofty Sudr Ameen at Madura an Original Suit No. 48 of 1856 against Ganapaty Iyen residing at Shevagungah and Deetchamien of Shevagungah but then residing at Madura

II In that Suit the Moofty Sudr Ameen under date the 17th of November 1856 issued an Istyanamah or Notice and in proceedings held by him under date the 15th of January 1857 he refused to cancel such Istyanamah or Notice

III The said Moofty Sudr Ameen by the same proceedings under date the 15th January 1857 directed that the Plaintiff in that Suit should prefer a Supplemental Plaint including therein as Defendants the Collector of Madura and the Guardian of the said Minor

IV The Civil Court of Madura by an Order dated the 6th of February 1857 made on a Miscellaneous Petition presented on behalf of your Petitioner and No. 96 of 1857 declared that the said Moofty Sudr Ameen was quite right in issuing the Istyar and declined interfering.

V The said Civil Court of Madura by an Order dated the 10th day of February 1857 made on a Miscellaneous Petition presented by the said Plaintiff and No. 101 of 1857 [illegible] Sudr Ameen

VI. Your Petitioner is aggrieved by such 2 Orders of the Civil Court for the following (amongst other) reasons

1stly As to the Order of the 6th of February 1857 Because the said Istyarnamah is bad its terms being too general and it is intended to affect your Petitioner (with many others) and to prevent his exercising his rights over his property, and at the same time he is precluded from defending those rights in consequence of his not having been made a Party to the said Suit in which the said Istyarnamah was issued

2ndly Because such Istyarnamah was issued on a mere statement made by a Vakeel unsupported by any evidence, or the Oath of the Plaintiff or even a statement signed by her, and without notice to any party who was to be affected thereby.

3rdly As to the Order of the 10th February 1857.

Because the suit has not been laid against all the parties who should have been included therein in asmuch as your Petitioner (with several others) is largely interested in the Tank the bund of which the Plaintiff seeks by her plaint to prevent from being raised As likewise in the supplying channel which is required to be lengthened for the due irrigation of lands to a large share of which your Petitioner is entitled. And therefore he submits that the Agent to the Court of Wards and your Petitioners Guardian as representing his interests should have been made Defendants to the said suit as required by the said Moofty Suder Ameen Or that your Petitioner should have been made a Defendant and permitted to defend the suit by the said Agent to the Court of Wards and his said Guardian — And

4thly Because the Plaintiff by her plaint while ostensibly limiting her suit to the seeking to [illegible] the 2 Defendants thereto from raising

Encroached for the purpose of builing the new wall of the Pagoda to which she lays claim and in the ground so Encroached upon your Petitioner has a large share with the Defendants and the other Parties before referred to.

Your Petitioner therefore most humbly prays that your Honorable Court will be pleased to admit this Petition and will also be [illegible] to reverse or rescind the said 2 orders made by the said Civil Court under date the 6th and the 10th days of February 1857 and will order that said Istyarnamah may be cancelled. And that the said Plaintiff be directed to add as Defendants to the said O. S. No. 480 of 1856 the said Collector of Madura and the Agent to the Court of Wards and the Guardian of your Petitioner as representing the interests of your Petitioner or that your Petitioner may be made a Defendant thereto and permitted to Defend the same by such Collector and Agent and his said Guardian And that your Honorable Court will be pleased to grant to your Petitioner such further or other Relief in the premises as the nature and circumstances of this case may require and to your Honorable Court shall seem meet.

And your Petitioner will Ever pray &c.

Madras
30th June 1857

Barrister at Law

I request to be heard orally on the matter of this Petition when the same shall be brought on for

Recd 21 December 1857. Receipt returned & order sent

Copy sent the Court of Wards 21 Jany 1858

A?

2/56
1857

Extract from the Proceedings of the Civil Court of Madura under date the 17th December 1857.

Read again application No. 658 of 1857 presented by Nagalingum pillay Pltff in O.S. No. 4 of 1856 praying for execution of Decree therein.

Read also Petition No. 669 of 1857 presented by Goorosawmy sastry Vakeel on behalf of Meenakshy Natchiar objecting in consequence of her appeal as a 3rd party to the execution of the said Decree, being granted.

Read also order of this Court dated 9th Instant on the above Petition No. 658 of 1857.

The Court on the 1st Instant declared its determination not to suspend execution of the decree, unless an order for suspension were received from the Sudder Adalut. It then granted a week to the objector's Vakeel to enable him to procure such order, and at the expiration of that week another week was granted, which has now come to a close. And as the objector has not produced the order as required, execution can not any longer be delayed.

The Court therefore directs that Precept.

Precept be issued to the Collector request ing him to place Nagalingum Pillay Plff in No. 4 of 1856 in possession of the disputed Villages, and remit to this Court the amount of Net Revenues adjudged by the Decree for payment to the said Nagalingum Pillay with interest on Costs together with all the proceeds of the disputed property up to date of execution -

Amount of Net Revenues adjudged by decree	10,693 - 11 - 9
Plffs costs of suit	884 - 3 - 11
Interest on costs from date of Decree	30 - 15 - 2
Revenues of disputed property up to date of execution	11,608 - 14 - 9

Ordered that Extract from these Proceedings be forwarded to the Ag. Collector of Madura for his information with Precept returnable in 15 days.

(True Extract)

A W Phillips
Acting Civil Judge

W Scoper

Exd. J W Haslam
A.D.

Lsd/
1/5/76

No. 1704
1857

In the Sudr Udalut

Appeal from Madura
O. S. No. 48/1856.

Maghoomay Natchiar

v

Ganapaty Iyen and Anr.

Copy.
Petition by Minor Zemindar of Sheevagunga against Order of Civil Court the 6" & 10 Feby 1857.

715105

2/15